UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ALEXANDER DANIEL HAMILTON,

Plaintiffs,

 \mathbf{v} .

Case No. 22-CV-1325

OFFICER NIKKI, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On June 7, 2023, plaintiff Alexander Daniel Hamilton, who is incarcerated and representing himself, filed a second motion to compel discovery. (ECF No. 32.) He requests the court to compel the defendants to produce various video footage relevant to his case. (*Id.* at 1.) Hamilton also discusses several other documents that he labels as exhibits, but these documents appear to have been provided by the defendants. It is unclear whether Hamilton is requesting these documents as well.

In response, the defendants state that Hamilton did not comply with Civil Local Rule 37 and attempt in good faith to meet and confer about the discovery requests. (ECF No. 34.) The defendants also state that they cannot produce the videos because they no longer exist. (*Id.* at 2.) As for Hamilton's other requests, the defendants note that they are unsure of what Hamilton is requesting and assert that they have provided all documents responsive to his discovery requests.

Because Hamilton did not meet and confer with defense counsel before filing his motion; because the court cannot compel the defendants to produce video that does not exist; and because the remainder of his requests are unclear, the court **DENIES** Hamilton's motion to compel.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 24th day of July, 2023.

BY THE COURT

WILLIAM E. DUFFIN

United States Magistrate Judge